

By WALLACE McCAMANT: Let American History Teach Patriotism

Perversion of American history by the injection of British propaganda into our textbooks as exposed by the series of articles written by Charles Grant Miller for the *Hearst newspapers* during the last six months received the attention of the National Society of Sons of the American Revolution at the annual meeting in Springfield, Mass. Wallace McCamant, president general of the organization, who made a strong fight for a truly American history, in the following article sets forth his reasons for telling the story of the Revolution with fidelity to facts and emphasizing the righteousness of our forefathers' cause and the colorful portrayal of the spirit of sacrifice on which our republic was built.

By WALLACE McCAMANT,

President-General of the National Society of Sons of the American Revolution.

I SEEK to inculcate no prejudice against Great Britain. I would have every school history make clear that George III has been dead for more than 100 years; that there is no responsible public opinion in Great Britain which now defends his policies or regrets that his plans came to grief.

But I am in accord with Charles Grant Miller, the author of the articles in the *Hearst papers*, in his contention that our American histories should have an American background; that the story of the American Revolution should be told with fidelity to the facts, with emphasis on the righteousness of our forefathers and with colorful portrayal of the heroic achievements and the patient spirit of sacrifice through which our political privileges were won.

What think you of a school history which begins the story of the American Revolution with this sentence:

"There is little use trying to learn whose fault it was that the war began, for, as we have seen, such a long train of events led to disagreement between England and America that we should have to go back and back to the very founding of the colonies. As in most quarrels, the blame is laid by each party on the other."

Another author of a school history, in discussing taxation without representation, says: "There was here an honest difference of opinion, and as neither party to the dispute would give way, a conflict was inevitable."

The man who has not found out who was right and who was wrong in the controversy which culminated at Lexington and Concord has certainly not been called

"Struggle in Which Our Ancestors Fought the Most Heroic of the Ages—Every Act of Noble Sacrifice to the Country, Every Instance of Patriotic Devotion to Her Cause, Has Its Beneficial Influence—A Nation's Character Is the Sum of Its Splendid Deeds."

of God to write American history. The men of the American Revolution have all gone to their reward. They can no longer vindicate the righteousness of the cause for which they fought. We, their descendants, live in a larger and better world because of the clearness of their vision and the self-render of their lives.

CALUMNY ON HANCOCK.

Shall we permit our children to be taught that the American Revolution was an unnecessary war, that after the lapse of a century and a half there is doubt about who was right?

One school history denounces the Boston Tea Party as a "lawless destruction of property," another as "a violent act viewed with great anger in England."

One history refers to John Hancock as a smuggler and the son of a smuggler. Except for a reference to the desire of the British authorities to capture and punish him there is no other reference in the book to this man who signed his name to the Declaration of Independence in letters so large that

George III could read them without his spectacles.

These men of the American Revolution were not perfect. They had like passions with ourselves. I do not object to their characterization in accordance with the facts. But this treatment of John Hancock is not characterization; it is calumny.

One of these histories says: "Some thoughtless people went too far and did foolish things like burning the effigy of the king or burning his portrait in the public square. In New York city the American soldiers pulled down a leaden statue of George III and melted it into bullets."

LIBEL VALLEY FORGE.

The author of this history is unhappy that the statue of George III no longer stands in the great metropolitan city. This travesty on American citizenship considers himself qualified to instruct young America, and I am advised that there are New York newspapers which endorse his qualifications.

One of the names with which Americans have conjured is Valley Forge. The fortitude and

steadfastness with which our forefathers endured the hardships of that terrible winter have been throughout our history the high water mark of patriotic devotion. In these later days a school historian tells us that one man in every five in that heroic band turned traitor and deserted to the British. If we stand for that libel who can maintain that we are worthy sons of the good men and true whose blood flows in our veins?

You will search these histories in vain for any mention of Nathan Hale, Sergeant Jasper, Mollie Pitcher and Beisy Ross. The story of Marion and Sumpter, of Pickens and Williams, is either ignored or compressed into three or four sentences.

Must Be Taught Price.

The true story of Ethan Allen, John Stark, Israel Putnam and Anthony Wayne will stir the blood of any real American. Put the story in not told in these books under fire.

What can we expect of the coming generation if their ideas of the genesis of our government are

garnered from such sources as these?

That which costs nothing has but little value. The franchises comprised in our bill of rights are not ours by grant from despotic power. Every one of them was wrested and defended by valorous achievement. If they are to be prized in the future, the coming generation must be taught the price which was paid for them by the fathers.

Works Slight the War.

I am aware that the story cannot be told in its fulness without reflecting on George III and the men who did his bidding. The George Rogers Clark expedition does not stand forth pictured in all its bright colors until we learn that Col. Henry Hamilton, the British commander at Detroit, had heavily subsidized the Indians on the frontier from the lakes to the Gulf; that it was his plan to let loose on the frontier these barbarous warriors to the end that in 1779 men, women and children in our frontier settlements might perish. This was the disaster averted by the heroism of the

"Hannibal of the West" and his little band of riflemen.

There are those who say that history should not stress war. Some of these school histories are written on this plan. One of them, comprising 627 pages in all, devotes seventeen pages to the Revolutionary War. There are important chapters in our peace time history which should be adequately covered; such for example as the great constructive work of Alexander Hamilton and John Marshall, the sterling Americanism of Henry Clay, the service rendered to the free soil cause by Abraham Lincoln. But nothing else will grip the imagination of the young like the story of the soldier or the sailor who fights and dies that his country may be free.

CLAY ACCEPTED CHALLENGE.

The chief value of the teaching of American history is the inculcation of patriotism. The teaching has no value whatever if the story of our past be told in colorless outline, and without dramatic power. If large space is devoted to our achievements in amassing wealth and small space to our sacrifices in winning freedom, the next generation is apt to place higher value on the dollar than on the flag.

The great men in our past have seen these truths. In January, 1816, a member of the anti-war party asked in the lower house in

Congress what we had gained by the 1812 war. Henry Clay took up the challenge. He spoke of national glory—"glory such as Hull of the Constitution, Jackson, Lawrence and Perry have acquired."

Mr. Clay continued: "Are gentlemen insensible to their deeds, to the value of them in animating the country in the hour of peril hereafter? Did the battle of Thermopylae preserve Greece but once? . . . Every act of noble sacrifice to the country—every instance of patriotic devotion to her cause—has its beneficial influence. A nation's character is the sum of its splendid deeds."

The struggle in which our forefathers fought was the most heroic of the ages. Their clarity of vision, their courage and self-sacrifice have proved magnificently fruitful. The excellence of their work has been attested by the march of events.

It is for us, their descendants, to tell and tell again the old story of what they did and suffered; to insist that that story be as familiar as the multiplication table to each generation of Americans; to see to it that the stars on the flag shine with undiminished luster; that the stripes speak to all Americans of the snow-white purity of our forefathers' motives and of the red blood they offered that government of the people, by the people and for the people might be established in this western world.

International Disputes Over "Spoils of China" Revealed by Dr. Reinsch

With the beginning of the European war, Japan's policy toward China, hitherto guarded more carefully by the Nippon government, became apparent. In this installment of his revelations of the character of Oriental diplomacy Dr. Reinsch enters a new phase of international disputes over the "spoils of China."

By DR. P. S. REINSCH,

Former U. S. Minister to China. Counsel to Chinese Republic.

On August 8, 1914, Japanese war vessels appeared near Tsingtau, Japan suggested on August 10 that the British government might call for the co-operation of Japan under the terms of the alliance. In view of possible consequences, the British government hesitated to make the call; the British in China considered it important that independent action by Japan in that country should be precluded.

Acting on its own account on August 15, the Japanese government sent the Shantung ultimatum to Germany. The British government was then informed of the action taken. The German representative in Peking had discussed informally with the foreign office the possibility of immediately returning Kiaochow directly to China; but the Chinese government now pointedly was warned by the Japanese that no such action would be permitted.

The Chinese government then also seriously considered the policy of declaring war on Germany. It would have been as easy for the Chinese as for anyone else, to take Kiaochow from the Germans, but Japan was ready and anticipating them. In fact, the Japanese minister stated to the Chinese foreign office on August 20 that the Kiaochow matter no longer concerned the Chinese government, which, he trusted, would remain absolutely passive in regard to it.

JAPAN'S ULTIMATUM.

The ultimatum to Germany, limited to August 23, demanded the delivery, at a date not later than September 15, of the leased territory of Kiaochow to the Japanese government, "with a view to the eventual restoration of the same to China."

Basing its action upon the language of this ultimatum, the American Government on August 19 sent a communication to the Japanese foreign office, noting with satisfaction that Japan demanded the surrender of Kiaochow with the purpose of restoring the tract to China, and that it was seeking no territorial aggrandizement in China.

On my return to Peking on September 10, I found the Chinese in a state of natural excitement over the action taken by Japan. By this time the Japanese had invested Tsingtau; the British, who had also sent a contingent of troops, were kept by the Japanese in a very subsidiary position.

The scope of Japan's plans was more fully revealed on September 29, when the Chinese government was informed that "military necessity" required the Japanese government to place troops along the entire railway in Shantung province. As this railway had never had German military guards, and as the portion near Tsingtau was already held by Japanese troops, the military necessity of such further occupation was by no means apparent.

Mr. Liang Tun-yen, minister of communications, called on me on October 1, expressing deep concern over the action of the Japanese in Shantung. He stated his conviction that, in departing from the necessary military operations

around Tsingtau, it was Japan's plan to stir up trouble in the interior of China with a view to more extensive occupation of Chinese territory.

AIMED AT INTERIOR.

From Japanese sources he had information to the effect that the Japanese militarists were not satisfied with the reduction of Tsingtau, but wished to take advantage of this opportunity to secure a solid footing—political and military—within the interior of China. He was further informed that they were ready to let loose large numbers of bandits and other irresponsible persons to co-operate with revolutionary elements in an attempt to create widespread uprisings. In order to furnish a pretext for military interference.

When I called attention to the declarations regarding Kiaochow in Japan's ultimatum to Germany, the minister shook his head and said: "Unfortunately, Japanese policy cannot be judged by such professions, but only by the acts of the last twenty years, which make up a series of broken pledges and attacks upon the rights of China."

President Yuan Shih-kai had wished to see me; so I called on him informally on October 2. In stronger terms than Minister Liang he set forth his apprehensions. "From information in my possession," he said, "I am convinced that the Japanese have a definite and far-reaching plan for using the European crisis to further an attempt to lap the foundations of control over China. In this, the control of Shantung through the possession of the port and the railway is to be the foundation stone."

"Their policy was made quite apparent through the threatened occupation of the entire Shantung railway, which goes far beyond anything the Germans ever attempted in Shantung province. It will bring the Japanese military forces to the very heart of China."

Thereupon Yuan Shih-kai requested that I ask President Wilson to use his good office in conferring with the British government in order to prevail upon Japan to restrict her action in Shantung to the military necessities involved in the capture of Tsingtau, according to the original assurances given the Chinese government. I communicated this request to the President through the Department of State.

JAPAN TAKES CONTROL.

With great promptness, however, the Japanese executed the plan they had adopted. They informed the Chinese that, being judges of their own military necessities, they would occupy the railway by force majeure immediately, but would leave its administration in Chinese hands—with the stipulation that Japanese conductors be placed on the trains. The Chinese found no means to resist this arrangement.

Mr. Eki Hioki, successor of Minister Yamaza, had arrived during the summer. He had for many years been minister to Chile, where I had met him in 1910; remembering his genial and social qualities, I was happy to renew this acquaintance. Mr. Hioki differs from his predecessor in his readiness to talk freely and abundantly. In our first conversation, when the relations between the United States and Japan came up, he adduced the customary argument that as the United States was preventing the Japanese from settling in America,

we could not in fairness object if Japan tried to develop her activities and influence on the Asiatic continent.

I could honestly assure him that American goodwill did go out in full measure to any legitimate development of Japanese enterprise and prosperity, but we also had duties toward our own citizens, who had been active in Chinese trade for more than 130 years, as well as toward China herself. We could not be expected to approve any action which would not respect the rights of these.

COULD NOT TRUST JAPAN.

The Chinese people were becoming more and more alarmed about Japan in Shantung. The large number of petitions and manifestoes which came to me, as the representative of a friendly nation from various parts of China,

WOMEN OF IRELAND ARE DIVIDED; MILITANT LEADERS AID TREATY

By PATRICIA HOEY,

One of the Leaders of the Pro-Treaty Women's Movement in Ireland.

MISS HOEY is one of the militant women who fought for Ireland's freedom; she returned to Dublin from Canada to fight in the Easter week rebellion of 1916. She became known as the "Flora Macdonald of Ireland" after the dramatic escape from her house of Michael Collins, after a 24-hour siege by Black and Tans.

(The following article deals with the part Irishwomen hope to play in the forthcoming elections on the treaty. It is the first of a series of three articles, written especially for *Universal Service*, showing how the women of the country may be expected to line up at the electoral battle.)

DUBLIN, May 27.

THE Pro-Treaty women of Ireland are going to play an even more prominent part than men in the coming elections, and in some emergencies they may take men's places. They will be led by some of the most famous women who fought in Easter Week and by women who were in prison for their republican activities in the late war—and these ladies will one and all publicly state their belief in the constitution of their new organization, namely, that the republic is not "let down."

The treaty is accepted by them as a good and powerful step toward complete independence.

The exact words of the constitution of the new organization—which is called Cumann na Saoirse (League of Freedom)—are as follows:

"Cumann na Saoirse is an independent body of Irish women pledged to work for the securing and maintaining of Ireland's right as an autonomous and sovereign state to determine freely her form of government. Immediate policy: To assist in the return at the forthcoming elections of candidates who accept the treaty as a step toward the complete independence of Ireland."

WOMEN STRONG FOR TREATY.

Many threats have already, it is said, been made against women who intend to vote for the treaty, but in spite of the utmost intimidation which can be used there can be but little question of the result

among women of the upper classes.

And if you go into the byways and the back streets where the workers and the wives of the workers live and query them about the treaty, you will be left with little doubt that the ordinary democratic women of Ireland will give an overwhelming vote for the treaty.

Not that they detest the republic. They don't. Ninety-nine out of a hundred ordinary pro-treaty women in Ireland, like their sisters in public life, are in favor of the treaty as a definite step toward full and complete freedom; they take it, they say, like Sean MacKeon, as a good installment of the liberty for which their comrades died. That is apparently why you find some of the most famous gunwomen and militarists on the pro-treaty side.

Take, for instance, Mrs. Dick Mulcahy, wife of the minister of defense, who as Min Ryan, as she then was, fought through Easter week and was the trusted confidante of Sean MacDermot (a signatory to the proclamation of the Irish Republic and shot by the English after the rising).

ORGANIZATION GROWS FAST.

Then there is Kathleen Browne, of Wexford, another Easter week woman and an old jailbird in Ireland's cause; Louise Gavan Duffy, who was one of the teachers in Padraic Pearse's school and who fought under his orders; and Moira Rigney, sister of Frank Rigney, of New York, who did nine months' hard labor for helping the Volunteers with guns and ammunition.

These are some of the women who are forming the new women's organization to fight the election for the treaty. Started only a few weeks ago, this organization is spreading like wildfire through Ireland. The immediate aim of the women is to win the elections for the treaty, which they believe give them immense opportunities for universal development.

The majority of them are trained election workers, many are former members of Cumann na Mban, others joined a political organization. There is one remarkable fact about them—namely, the number of professional and educated women who have rallied actively to their ranks. These now stand side by side with the poorer working

women—doctors, journalists, teachers, shopgirls, charwomen and servants in the one great combine for the treaty.

Branches of the organization already exist in Queen's County, Kildare, Leitrim, Westmeath, Galway, Sligo, Limerick, Killarney, Cork, Waterford City, Monaghan, Donegal and Dublin. Many counties have several branches, and every county is forming them.

The women are instantly taking up the local election work, writing up the canvassers' books, canvassing, collecting and bill posting. They are working, of course, with the men's committees, and if threats of physical violence are used the latter are prepared to take their places and run the elections single-handed. Many of them have already acted as presiding and returning officers, poll clerks, personating agents, etc., at former elections.

In one word women will not only give the casting vote in the forthcoming elections, but they will play a more prominent part than women have ever before played in Irish affairs.

There is one point on which the women on both sides are agreed—they want women candidates. So far no candidates of either sex or side have been nominated.

The organized opposition women are confined to the Cumann na Mban, which up to the present has been a military and not a political organization. They have now, however, entered the political arena and expelled every member who would not consent to oppose the treaty.

YOUNG FARMER GIRLS JOIN.

The organization is chiefly, but by no means solely, composed of young girls of the working and farmer class, and generally speaking, they have little technical knowledge of election work which was in the past generally left to the women of Sinn Fein. It is difficult as yet to estimate their strength, as it is not certain how many have gone over to the pro-treaty side.

Here is also the fact that just before the recent convention anti-treaty organizers were sent down through the country to reform branches of the Cumann na Mban for the purpose of the convention, which had become moribund during the Irish war.

as a whole, the connivance of their militarist government was a fact.

True, the Chinese had encouraged American activities in China. They had looked upon them as a safeguard to their own national life. Since they were conducted in a fair spirit and without political afterthought, the Chinese did hope and expect as a minimum that Americans would stand by their guns and not let themselves be excluded by political intrigue or other means from their share in the development and activities of China.

CHINESE EXPRESSED FEARS.

"Japan is going to take advantage of this war to get control of China." In these words President Yuan Shih-kai summed up the situation when I made my first call on him after returning from Europe in September. Many Chinese friends came to see me

and tell me their fears. Admiral Tsai said: "Here are the beginnings of another Manchuria. Aggressive Japan in Shantung is different from any European tenant."

Events had moved rapidly. Tsingtau had been taken. German control had been wholly eliminated from the leasehold and the railway. The Chinese government notified Japan that permission to use part of the province of Shantung for military operations would be withdrawn, since occasion for it had disappeared. This the Japanese had seized as a calculated and malignant insult; it was made the excuse for presentation of the demands.

The blow fell on January 18. The Japanese minister sought a private interview with Yuan Shih-kai. This meeting took place at night. With a men of great mystery and importance the minister opened the discussion. He enjoined absolute secrecy on pain of serious consequences beforehand. He made therewith an oral statement of the considerations which favored the granting of them.

The Chinese, fearing greater evils, did their best to guard the secret. They could not, however, keep in complete ignorance those whose interests would have been vitally affected; also memoranda of important conversations had to be set down. As soon as I received the first inkling of what was going on, I impressed it upon the Chinese that, since the subjects under discussion intimately affected the American rights in China, I should be kept fully informed in order that my Government, relying on the treaties and understandings concerning Chinese independence, could take necessary steps to comply with my request.

The British looked upon the new adventure of Japan with a decided lack of enthusiasm. While welcoming the losses inflicted on their enemy in war, they were evidently fearful of the results which might come from Shantung.

It was plain that the Russians; too, while allied with Japan, were quite aware of the dangers inherent in the Chinese situation. Taken with recent Japanese advances in Inner Mongolia, a situation was created in northern China which would be regarded as dangerous by the Russians. Discussing the unrest in China, the Russian minister said to me significantly:

"The situation itself does not impress me as serious; the only serious thing about it is the Japanese say it is serious."

JAPS ACTION DISQUIETING.

In fine, the general temper and direction of Japanese action was not relished by the allies of Japan. Japan had taken advantage of a conflict which was primarily European, into the rigor of which she did not enter, for the purpose of gathering up the possessions of Germany in the Far East and the Pacific at a time when they could be but weakly defended.

This policy of Japan deeply affected American prospects and enterprise in China, as also, that of the other leading nations. Since the American attitude of good will toward China had in the past been understood by the Chinese to imply readiness to give them a certain support in times of need, large hopes were entertained as to what the United States would do. Rich and powerful beyond measure, she would, in the minds of the Chinese, help China to maintain her integrity, independence and sovereignty.

Other nations, not a little jealous

and tell me their fears. Admiral Tsai said: "Here are the beginnings of another Manchuria. Aggressive Japan in Shantung is different from any European tenant."

Events had moved rapidly. Tsingtau had been taken. German control had been wholly eliminated from the leasehold and the railway. The Chinese government notified Japan that permission to use part of the province of Shantung for military operations would be withdrawn, since occasion for it had disappeared. This the Japanese had seized as a calculated and malignant insult; it was made the excuse for presentation of the demands.

The blow fell on January 18. The Japanese minister sought a private interview with Yuan Shih-kai. This meeting took place at night. With a men of great mystery and importance the minister opened the discussion. He enjoined absolute secrecy on pain of serious consequences beforehand. He made therewith an oral statement of the considerations which favored the granting of them.

The Chinese, fearing greater evils, did their best to guard the secret. They could not, however, keep in complete ignorance those whose interests would have been vitally affected; also memoranda of important conversations had to be set down. As soon as I received the first inkling of what was going on, I impressed it upon the Chinese that, since the subjects under discussion intimately affected the American rights in China, I should be kept fully informed in order that my Government, relying on the treaties and understandings concerning Chinese independence, could take necessary steps to comply with my request.

The British looked upon the new adventure of Japan with a decided lack of enthusiasm. While welcoming the losses inflicted on their enemy in war, they were evidently fearful of the results which might come from Shantung.

It was plain that the Russians; too, while allied with Japan, were quite aware of the dangers inherent in the Chinese situation. Taken with recent Japanese advances in Inner Mongolia, a situation was created in northern China which would be regarded as dangerous by the Russians. Discussing the unrest in China, the Russian minister said to me significantly:

JAPS ACTION DISQUIETING.

In fine, the general temper and direction of Japanese action was not relished by the allies of Japan. Japan had taken advantage of a conflict which was primarily European, into the rigor of which she did not enter, for the purpose of gathering up the possessions of Germany in the Far East and the Pacific at a time when they could be but weakly defended.

This policy of Japan deeply affected American prospects and enterprise in China, as also, that of the other leading nations. Since the American attitude of good will toward China had in the past been understood by the Chinese to imply readiness to give them a certain support in times of need, large hopes were entertained as to what the United States would do. Rich and powerful beyond measure, she would, in the minds of the Chinese, help China to maintain her integrity, independence and sovereignty.

Other nations, not a little jealous

of the past good will of the Chinese toward us, were not slow to point out that American friendship was a bubble which vanished before such concrete difficulties as the violation of China's neutrality. But the Chinese, after all, saw that it did not lie within the sphere of its action for the United States to come to the rescue with direct political and military support.

A Japanese press reporter called at the legation on January 19 and related his troubles to one of the secretaries. The Japanese minister refused absolutely, he said, to say anything about what passed between him and the president, therefore he had sought the American legation, which might help him. With his assumed naivete, the man possibly hoped to get a hint as to whether a "leak" had occurred between the Chinese and the American minister. But it was not until January 22 that I learned the astonishing nature of the Japanese proposals.

Calling on one of the Chinese ministers on current business, I found him perturbed. He finally confided to me, almost with tears, that Japan had made categorical demands, which, if conceded, would destroy the independence of his country and reduce her to a servile state. He then told me in general terms their nature, saying: "Control of natural resources, finances, army! What will be left to China? Our people are being punished for their peacefulness and sense of justice." The blow evidently had come with stunning force, and the counselors of the president had not been able to overcome the first terrified surprise or to develop any idea as to how the crisis might be met.

Copyright, 1922, by Dr. Paul S. Reinsch.

Lovers of Egypt Wooded Sweeties In Modern Style

CHICAGO, May 27.

HOW the lovesick pyramid builder used to scratch the emotions of a heart on a brick which he hurled through the window of an Egyptian belle was discussed by solemn scientists here.

Love's origin was one of the topics at the University of Chicago, where professors celebrated the hundredth anniversary of the decipherment of Egyptian hieroglyphics.

Dr. A. R. Nykl, of Northwestern University, spoke on love as it has been translated from old times. Wooing four thousand years ago was not much different, it seems, than in these days of flappers and joy riders.

"The Egyptian and Arabian definitions of love was the same as that of the troubadours," Dr. Nykl said. "They believed it was the union of two souls who have been united in the world above. They also believed that love entered the heart through the eyes."

"The manifestations of love through the ages are the same. The lovesick one wants to be alone. He falls into confusion when his loved one approaches. He wants to drink from the cup which her lips touched. The ancient lovers believed one could fall in love with a woman by simply hearing a description of her."

In connection with the celebration of the decipherment of hieroglyphics the American Oriental Society is holding its annual meeting at the university,